

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claim 15 is amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Applicants acknowledge the allowance of claims 5-7, 9 and 13, and the indication that claims 4, 11 and 12 define patentable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner once again is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested in view of the following Remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and claims 2, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, over Hashimoto U.S. Patent 6,072,457 ("Hashimoto"); and claims

Applicants respectfully traverse those rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Among other things, in the method of claim 1 at least two line-memories are used, and when one of the line-memories is in a writing operation, the other one of the line-memories is subjected to a repeatedly reading control.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hashimoto does not disclose or even suggest any method including such a combination of features. Indeed, the Office Action fails to explicitly cite anything in Hashimoto that discloses such a combination of features, instead just generally averring that "the subject matter in claim 1 is met by the disclosure of Hashimoto" from col. 11, line 45 through col. 12, lines 4.

Applicants respectfully disagree that Hashimoto discloses any method including such a combination of features in the cited text, or anywhere else.

At the outset, the cited text at col. 11, line 45 through col. 12, lines 4 pertains to an "Example 6" describing to an embodiment shown in FIGs. 14A-B, 15, 16 and

17. As is very clearly shown in FIGs. 14A-B and 15, this embodiment does not even have "two line-memories," instead being designed to operate with the single line memory 3 in Fig. 14A.¹ So, the text also certainly could not (and does not) disclose that "when one of the line-memories is in a writing operation, the other one of the line-memories is subjected to a repeatedly reading control."

Therefore, Hashimoto cannot disclose the method of claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is deemed patentable over Hashimoto.

Claim 3

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and is deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, and for the following additional reasons.

Among other things, in the method of claim 3 the constant rate at which the samples of the written sequence are sequentially read out, corresponds to a dot-frequency of an image to be displayed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hashimoto does not disclose or even suggest any method including such a feature. Indeed, the Office Action fails to explicitly cite anything in Hashimoto that discloses such a feature, instead just generally averring that "the subject matter in claim 1 is met by the disclosure of Hashimoto" from col. 11, line 45 through col. 12, lines 4.

Applicants respectfully disagree that Hashimoto discloses any method including such a feature in the cited text, or anywhere else. Indeed, to the contrary, Hashimoto discloses that the data is read out of the line memory three pixels at a time, instead of at the dot or pixel rate of the display device.

Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, claim 3 is deemed patentable over Hashimoto.

¹ Indeed, oddly, the Office Action cites that the completely different embodiment of FIG. 2 (Example 1) as showing two line memories. However, Example/Embodiment 1 of FIG. 2 does not include the other features of claim 1, for example "the line-memories being applied with an input digital video signal," as it is clear from FIG. 2 and the text at col. 6, lines 4-9.

Claim 8

Among other things, the display device of claim 8 includes two line memories, wherein when one of the line-memories is in a writing operation, the other one of the line-memories is subjected to a repeatedly reading control.

As explained above with respect to claim 1, Hashimoto does not disclose any display device including such a combination of features.

Accordingly, for at least similar reasons to those set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 8 is deemed patentable over Hashimoto.

Claim 10

Claim 10 depends from claim 8 and is deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 8, and for the following additional reasons.

Among other things, in the device of claim 10 the constant rate at which the samples of the written sequence are sequentially read out, corresponds to a dot-frequency of an image to be displayed.

As explained above with respect to claim 3, Hashimoto does not disclose any display device including such a feature.

Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, claim 10 is deemed patentable over Hashimoto.

Claims 2 and 14

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and claim 14 depends from 8, and these claims are deemed patentable over Hashimoto for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 8, respectively, and for the following additional reasons.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hashimoto to include dual port devices "in order to more efficiently write and read video information from the memories."

Applicants respectfully traverse this statement of Official Notice, and submit that there is no motivation or suggestion in the prior art to modify any line memory in

Hashimoto as alleged. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an affidavit as required by 37 CFR § 1.104(d)(2) if this rejection continues to be maintained based a motive for modification not explicitly suggested in the prior art (see MPEP § 2144.03).

Claim 15

Claim 15 has been amended to correct a typographical error regarding its dependency, and now correctly states that it depends from claim 9. Claim 9 is allowed, and so claim 15 is deemed allowable as well.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 1-15 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (571) 283.0720 to discuss these matters.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment (except for the issue fee) to Deposit Account No. 50-0238 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE FRANCOS & WHITT, P.L.L.C.

Date: 14 November 2005

By: 
Kenneth D. Springer
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE FRANCOS & WHITT, P.L.L.C.
One Freedom Square
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260
Reston, Virginia 20190
Telephone No.: (571) 283-0724
Facsimile No.: (571) 283-0740